REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office action mailed November 9, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-20 are now pending in this application, with Claims 1, 15, and 20 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 3, 11, 12, 15, and 20 have been amended, and Claims 2 and 10 have been canceled herein. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, and 10-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,783,893 (Dade et al.), and Claims 1, 2, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,998,142 (Meyertons). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 relates to a generator that includes a rotor frame having a cylindrical body that includes inner surface that defines a inner cavity, an outer surface, a first end, and a second end; a drive shaft coupled to the cylindrical body first end along an axis; a generator housing having an inner surface that defines a substantially cylindrical cavity about the axis; a first rotor armature coupled to the inner surface of the cylindrical body and defining a space to receive a stator assembly, and recites, *inter alia*, a first stator fixedly coupled to the generator housing and extending into the interior cavity via the cylindrical body second end, the first stator positioned within the space defined by the first rotor armature and substantially aligned with the driveshaft along the axis.

Independent Claim 15 relates to a generator that includes a cylindrical body having an inner surface, an outer surface, an axis, and defining an interior cavity; a driveshaft coupled to the cylindrical body along the axis of the cylindrical body; a generator housing having an inner surface that defines a substantially cylindrical cavity about the axis; a first rotor assembly coupled to the inner surface of the cylindrical body, the first rotor assembly defining a space to receive a stator, and recites, *inter alia*, a first stator fixedly coupled to the generator housing and extending into the interior cavity, the

first stator positioned within the space defined by the first rotor assembly and substantially aligned with the driveshaft along the axis.

Dade et al. relates to an electrical machine that includes a rotor having two rotor sections, an inner rotor section and an outer rotor section, and further includes two stators, an inner stator and an outer stator. The inner and outer rotor sections are coupled to a rotationally mounted drive shaft, and the inner and outer stators are fixedly mounted to a housing. However, nowhere does Dade et al. disclose, or even remotely suggest, at least that one of the stators is fixedly coupled to the housing, extends into the interior cavity, is positioned within the space defined by one of the rotors, and is substantially aligned with the driveshaft along the axis, as is now recited in independent Claims 1 and 15.

Meyertons also relates to an electrical machine that includes inner and outer rotor assemblies and inner and outer stators, all mounted within a housing. The inner stator is, however, rotationally mounted within the housing. Similar to Dade et al., Meyertons fails to disclose, or even remotely suggest, at least that one of the stators is fixedly coupled to the housing, extends into the interior cavity, is positioned within the space defined by one of the rotors, and is substantially aligned with the driveshaft along the axis, as is now recited in independent Claims 1 and 15.

Hence, it is clear that both Dade et al. and Meyertons fail to disclose, or even remotely suggest, at least the above-noted features of independent Claims 1 and 15. Namely, both of these references fail to disclose or suggest at least that one of the stators is fixedly coupled to the housing, extends into the interior cavity, is positioned within the space defined by one of the rotors, and is substantially aligned with the driveshaft along the axis.

In view of the above, and because Claims 10-14 depend from Claim 1, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 4, 7-9, 16, 17, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Meyertons, and U.S. Patent No. 3,676,764 (Syverson),

and Claims 5, 6, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Meyertons, Syverson, and U.S. Patent No. 4,647,806 (Giuffrida) These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 20 recites subject matter that is at least commensurate in scope with the above-noted features of independent Claims 1 and 15 that are not disclosed in both Dade et al. or Meyertons. Moreover, upon review of both Syverson and Giuffrida, Applicant submits that these references also fail to disclose, or even remotely suggest, at least this feature.

In view of the foregoing, and because dependent Claims 3-9 and 16-19 depend from independent Claims 1 and 15, respectively, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is requested.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claims 1, 15, and 20 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: January 26, 2006

By: _____

Paul D. Amrozowicz
Reg. No. 45,264
(480) 385-5060